



# FOREST ECONOMICS DEPARTMENT

## NEWSLETTER

Editors: Michael Jones and David Cope

Finnish Forest Research Institute, Helsinki, Finland

Kaisaniemenkatu 1, 00100 Helsinki 10

No. 22/11.11.1971

### SECOND ANNIVERSARY ISSUE

#### Departmental personnel

##### Head of Department:

Prof. Lauri Heikinheimo

##### Professor of business economics (acting):

Prof. Lorenzo Runeberg (plastics and wood)

##### Professor Emeritus:

Prof. N.A. Osara (Finland's forestry in the world economy)

##### Research specialist:

Dr. Matti Palo (forecasting and optimization models)

##### Researchers:

David Cope (land-use economics)

Matti Heikinheimo (standard of living of forest workers)

Jan Heino (social benefits of forests)

Terho Huttunen (wood consumption)

Jouko Hämäläinen (economics of thinning)

Buddhi Jha (Finnish scholarship)

Michael Jones (land tenure)

Heikki Juslin (consumer behaviour)

Pertti Mikkola (waste wood)

Simo Penttilä (nursery economics)

Aarne Reunala (structural change in forest ownership)

Dr. Esko Salo (removal measurement)

Sampsa Sivonen (regeneration economics)

Hannu Vehviläinen (forest labour)

##### Assistant researchers:

Markku Aho (roundwood removals)

Olli Nissilä (forecasting, optimization, recycling)

Tatu Ollikainen (capital-equipment costs)

Ilpo Tikkanen (promotion of private forestry)

##### Extra-departmental researchers:

Prof. Seppo Ervasti (forest balance)

Dr. Veli-Pekka Järveläinen (silvicultural behaviour of forest owners)

Heikki Kunnas (forestry in national accounting)

##### Research secretary:

Marja Harmanen

##### Research assistants, calculators and typists:

Aune Kankkunen, Maija Kuusijärvi, Seija Malinen, Asko Niemi, Simon Parr, Helena

Päivinen, Rakel Seppälä, Anna-Leena Simula, Brita Sjöstrand, Maija-Liisa Soveri,

Kaija Westin, Juhani Hongisto

##### Vahtimestari:

Erkki Berg

### Colloquium

On 15th November at 14.15 in the Department's conference room, Prof. Lorenzo Runeberg will be leading a discussion about the new professorship in business economics, which has been established in the Department.

The State budget for 1971 included funds for a new professorship in forest economics to be established by the Forest Research Institute. The text of the budget proposal states that the "post of professor (business economics of forestry) is established" to deal with "directing the research work in the fields of social economics, business economics and marketing in forestry."

It is interesting to consider, however, the duties of the Economics Department, as outlined by the decree concerning the duties of the Forest Research Institute. "The Forest Economics Department investigates national-economics, social, business-economics and marketing questions in forestry, examines total drain and wood consumption, and with the help of the Department of Forest Inventory investigates forest balance."

Thus if one keeps to the letter of the law, a very substantial part of the work of the Forest Economics Department falls within the scope of the new professorship. Apparently, however, the boundary is not very clearly defined; according to another section of the decree concerning the Institute, the general duties of a professor cover all aspects of running a department. This is due to the fact that the laws date from a time when there was only one professor per department and they have not been changed with the creation of new professorships within departments.

Prof. Runeberg hopes that discussion of the current situation in the Department can help to clarify the future distribution of the work and determine what should be the main fields of responsibility.

---

### Lauri Heikinheimo (philosophy revisited)

#### A RESEARCH UNIT - TRENDS AND PROSPECTS

Two main principles have been guiding the development of the Forest Economics Department. First is the international character of all research. It seems to be easy to foster a kind of national applied science behind a language barrier, such as Finnish, and so be criticized only on the basis of practical applications. It is essential that science be kept open for international criticism of a more theoretical nature.

Second, applied science is proper science only when it is proper in terms of the science being applied. That is, forest economics is proper science only when it is proper economics since economics does not change fundamentally when applied to sub-sectors of the economy. This means that we can apply economics (macro or micro), sociology and so forth to forestry and the forest industry properly only if we have acquired in one way or another a deep enough insight into the science involved. Otherwise, we can easily find ourselves working behind a "specialist's" barrier inside which, for example, general economists are not allowed on the pretence that they do not understand much of anything about our very special circumstances. This seems to be an effective way of chasing outsiders back behind the barrier.

The result is that general economists don't much care about the doings of forest economists and in fact don't regard forest economics as economics at all.

The principle of the international character of science has led us to put much weight on the ability of all people in the Department to manage in at least one major language. So far this has been English. The goal has been the level required by international organizations, such as FAO. This includes the ability to write fairly easily drafts of papers and letters and to speak freely. Every researcher should be able to write his manuscripts in English and present and discuss them at meetings.

To help reach this goal, we have had, since 1968 when David Cope was first here, one or more English-speaking researchers working in the Department. Table 1 illustrates one side of the results. Included are only those who have reached the B- level, which is the standard required of researchers going to the USA for post-graduate studies. An A indicates fluent knowledge of the language and shows roughly the writing and speaking ability mentioned above.

Table 1. English-test results for 1969, 1970 and 1971, for those with a grade of B- or better.

	1969	1970	1971		1969	1970	1971
Markku Aho	-	-	A-	Pertti Mikkola	B+	-	-
Marja Harmanen	C+	-	B	Juhani Numminen	A	-	-
Erkki Heikinheimo	-	A	-	Tatu Ollikainen	-	-	B+
Lasse Heikinheimo	B	-	A-	Helena Päivinen	-	B+	-
Matti Heikinheimo	C	B-	-	Aarne Reunala	B	A-	-
Jan Heino	-	-	A-	Lorenzo Runeberg	-	-	A-
Marja Immonen	-	B+	-	Pirjo Saramäki	-	B	-
Raili Ivanoff	-	B	-	Brita Sjöstrand	D+	C+	B
Paavo Kajander	B-	-	-	Maija-Liisa Soveri	-	-	A-
Kari Keipi	C	A-	-				

The most remarkable aspect of these test results is, in my opinion, the fact that after all not much systematic teaching of the language has been done. There were lessons in the beginning, but gradually these disappeared as both teachers and pupils found themselves with too much work in their research and other studies. What was left was meeting David, Mike Jones and Buddhi Jha every day, going to the colloquia, and dealing with English in literature, our own publications and this Newsletter. The main thing probably is that we have all gradually forgotten to take notice of the fact that we use two, or with Swedish three, languages in the Department.

A number of my colleagues have felt that the language goal set for our personnel is much too high and utopian. My opinion is that within a few decades in most of the research units in this country we will have English or Russian as the main language. The basic writing and speaking knowledge of English will be in the possession of every researcher automatically if we only continue to have English-speaking colleagues among us. This seems to be a very easy way of maintaining and improving the linguistic capabilities within a research unit.

The fields of general economics, statistics, mathematics, sociology, etc. cannot be dealt with so easily. They must be studied actively, and preferably systematically, under the guidance of the appropriate university professor and including seminars, theses and examinations. A nearby university of high standard is invaluable. But in any case it takes years to acquire a degree.

I am glad that at least a couple of our researchers have already taken degrees: Jouko Hämäläinen in business economics and Veli-Pekka Järveläinen in sociology. Many more are making good progress: Matti Palo and Hannu Vehviläinen in national economics, Kari Keipi and Simo Penttilä in business economics, Aarne Reunala in statistics, Matti Heikinheimo in social policy, and Heikki Juslin in social psychology. David Cope and Michael Jones continue their studies and Jouko Virta has completed nearly the full degree in law in addition to his forestry degree.

For a research department, this might appear to be putting rather much weight on studying. But what else is a scientist (or should be) if not a "professional student?" Continuous studying and practicing is needed to keep us up to date in science as well as languages. This should be started on a firm basis and then kept going without any lapses.

In order to facilitate developing those research tools (languages and continuous studying), some sort of **standard** must be established for personnel to be taken into a department. Most of our personnel are chosen from among the students or graduates of the forest economics departments of Helsinki University. The number of new students permitted to enter the forestry faculty each year is limited to 55. This year there were 519 applicants, so only 11 % were accepted. Acceptance is based mainly on school work and the results of the student exam, but also to a lesser extent on practical work in forestry and university examinations.

In our Department, we have had since the early 1960s more than enough applicants for all types of research-oriented vacancies. Thus from the select group admitted to the forestry faculty, we have been able to choose the very best people, one to four from each course. Selection methods have been discussed many times, but there does not seem to be any better approach than to rely on school results and recommendations of university teachers. As a general means of rating both school work and the student examination, we apply the points given for admission to the forestry faculty. Special weight is given to languages and mathematics. The highest rating so far has been 32 points. Table 2 shows the percentage distribution for students accepted to study forestry, those selected to work in the Department and, of the latter, those who will be working for the Department at the beginning of 1972.

Table 2. Percentage distribution of forestry students on the basis of school-performance points, 1965-70.

	School-performance points				Total
	10-15	16-20	21-25	26-32	
1. All students admitted to the forestry faculty	6	38	37	9	100
2. Those of 1 who worked for the Department	3	36	19	42	100
3. Those of 2 who will be working for the Department 1.1.1971	11	11	25	58	100
Total number of students involved: 1 = 280; 2 = 36; 3 = 12					

These are the general principles for choosing and guiding their studies in this research unit. Looking at the results after a decade of experience I don't see any reasons for altering the guidelines. On the contrary, they could have been followed more exactly. Also, more personnel from political-science faculties and business schools could be considered for positions.

No mention of our guidelines can be made, however, without including our efforts towards creating a suitable working atmosphere for young, eager scientists in search of new ideas. Nothing is so difficult as to say exactly what creates that atmosphere. Perhaps it is freedom from authority, the selection of people, the size of our unit, the coffee breaks together in the kitchen, flowers, and informal dress and addressing. We are waiting for a psychologist to make a study of the working atmosphere for the whole Forest Research Institute. The result might prove something. Now it can only be said that most of us seem to be happy with the working atmosphere of the Department.

But what about the results of our work? I am not in a position to make an impartial judgement on our publications. Even so, it would appear that, if anything, the quantity is too high rather than too low.

---

### New publications

Huttunen, Terho. Who's who in the Nordic Forest Economics Seminar. Helsinki, 1971.

Järveläinen, Veli-Pekka. Vähäsen faktorianalyysistä. Summary: Some aspects concerning the use of factor analysis. Silva Fennica, 5:3. Helsinki, 1971.

Kunnas, Heikki J. Forestry in national accounts. Tiivistelmä: Metsätalouden kansantulo-osuuden laskenta. Folia Forestalia, 121. Helsinki, 1971.

Kuokkanen, Pentti. Metsänviljelytaimien kasvatuskustannukset vuosina 1969 ja 1972. Summary: Costs of growing forest-tree seedlings in nurseries in 1969 and 1972. Folia Forestalia, 122. Helsinki, 1971.

Numminen, Juhani. Puulevyjen käyttö Uudenmaan talousalueella v. 1967 valmistuneissa rakennuksissa. Summary: The use of wood-based panels in buildings completed in 1967 in the Uusimaa Economic Region. Folia Forestalia, 123. Helsinki, 1971.

Salo, Esko, & Risto Seppälä. Kiinteistöjen polttoraakapuun käytön väli-inventointi vuosina 1969/70. Summary: Fuelwood consumption on farms and in buildings, intermediate inventory, 1969/70. Folia Forestalia, 120. Helsinki, 1971.

Seppälä, Risto. Estimation of timber removals by double sampling based on mail inquiries. Seloste: Postitiedusteluun perustuva kaksoisotanta hakkuupoistuman estimoinnissa. Communicationes Instituti Forestalis Fenniae, 74:2. Helsinki, 1971.

-"- . Simulation of timber-harvesting systems. Seloste: Puun korjuuketjujen simulointi. Folia Forestalia, 125. Helsinki, 1971.

-"- . Variable probabilities in sample-tree selection. Seloste: Vaihtelevat poimintatodennäköisyydet koepuutannassa. Communicationes Instituti Forestalis Fenniae, 74:4. Helsinki, 1971.

---

### So Few News

The Forest Economics Department Newsletter has recently received two issues of SoFew News. This is the newsletter of the Southern Forest Economics Workers, of which (according to them) there are so few. It is stated in the newsletter that So Few News is sent free and postpaid to worthy individuals and organizations. It is published by the Department of Forestry, School of Forest Resources, North Carolina State University, PO Box 5488, Raleigh, North Carolina 27607. Those interested in this newsletter should contact the editors, J.O. Lammi, or the staff assistant, Mrs. Alice Shirley.

The last issue of SoFew News contained an article by Prof. Albert C. Worrell which the editors of the Forest Economics Department Newsletter feel might be of interest to others. The article follows, and is number two in the series of articles on forest economics outside of Finland - a series initiated in our last Newsletter with the aim of increasing research contacts and the flow of information to our readers.

---

### Forest Economics Outside Finland, II

In 1970, Prof. Worrell spent seven months in West Germany and was impressed by some of the things he saw. Writing as an American forest economist reacting to things noticed, and not as an expert on German forestry, Prof. Worrell noted, in an article in SoFew News (vol. 3, no. 4), the areas which seemed most important to him.

#### SOME OBSERVATIONS ON FORESTRY IN WEST GERMANY

Albert C. Worrell  
Edwin W. Davis Professor of Forest Policy  
Yale University  
New Haven, Connecticut

The use of German forest land is severely restricted in two fundamental ways. First, those areas which serve an important protection function or have unstable soils or fragile ecosystems were identified years ago and now are in effect zoned against other uses. No matter who owns them, he cannot harvest the timber, graze livestock, or do other things which are not compatible with their role in environmental stability. Second, no owner is free to remove the forest and devote his land to other uses when he feels like it. He must have official permission and this is difficult to obtain. In effect, most of the forested land is permanently in forest. The most striking result is that there is practically no speculation in forest land. Forest land prices are based on the productivity of land for timber, unless recreation or some other forest use is possible.

The most important forest owners in West Germany are the states; there are virtually no federal forests. The large forest-products companies also own very little land. What the Germans call "corporate" forests are owned by a variety of municipalities, churches, associations, and other semi-public organizations. A substantial area is owned by farmers and other small private holders, much of it in very small parcels. The state forests are intensively managed and most of the "corporate" forests are also managed by the state forests on the same basis. Some of the small private forests are well managed but many are just allowed to grow as they are in the United States. The programs to educate and assist these small owners do not seem to be much more successful than ours, especially in those regions where landownership is so fragmented as make rational individual management uneconomic.

I was especially impressed by the way recreation is handled. The Germans are great walkers and on weekends and holidays the forests near towns or cities are heavily used (many Germans even walk in the forests in winter). However, when I asked how they resolved the conflict between recreation and timber growing, the usual answer was: "What conflict? We manage our forests for both purposes and have always had to." Several factors contribute to their success. A network of well-planned footpaths with frequent benches and scenic spots is intensively maintained in the parts of the forests most accessible to people. (It is common to see very elderly people with canes and young families with baby carriages on these forest paths.) On most forests, all roads are closed to all vehicles except those of the forest administration. This has wide public support and it is not unusual for a forest officer to be glared at by the walkers even though he is in uniform and driving a forest administration vehicle. Finally, the recreationists do not resent having cordwood and sawlogs decked along their footpaths. Some forest officers told me that the walkers liked this evidence that the forest was being used since they were afraid to venture far into a "wild" forest. Silvicultural operations are usually modified near the heavily used areas for aesthetic purposes but proceed normally on the rest of the forest.

Protection is a relatively minor problem. Fires are infrequent and because of the large population are quickly reported and suppressed. Diseases and insects are dealt with as part of the intensive silviculture. Animal damage, however, is a serious problem in many places. Since all forests are managed to produce game as one of the crops, this often conflicts with the regeneration of timber. I did not see any real economic analyses which tried to determine an optimum combination.

Clearcutting is a standard silvicultural tool. But, the area cut over at any one time is quite restricted and does not have the visual impact of the large cutovers in our country. Spruce, fir, and the hardwoods are usually regenerated through some form of shelterwood system in which the mature stand is removed gradually and regeneration is well established before the last old trees are harvested. This is still even-aged management but it does not give the undesirable impression of the forest being "slaughtered" at harvest time. I did see Scots pine being clearcut with the slash windrowed and burned, the ground disked, and the new stand planted by machine. The forester said there had been no negative public reaction although he had been careful to treat only small areas at one time. Since the German foresters do their own harvesting, they have good control over how things are done in this critical stage of management.

German forestry has some serious economic problems which are of great current concern to the foresters and forest administrations. Over and over, I was told that it is no longer possible to manage forests profitably. There seem to be at least three reasons for this situation.

A major reason lies in the market for forest products. The market for fuelwood has almost disappeared and lumber and timbers have been replaced in construction by plywood, particle board, building boards, and non-woven materials. The consumption of wood in pulp manufacture is increasing. But the overall effect has been a drastic change in the species, sizes, and qualities of wood in demand. Many German forests were historically geared to producing beech and oak for fuelwood and construction uses but the demand today is for conifers. The silvicultural problems involved in converting the forests to different species are tremendous and are especially serious because many German forests occur on natural hardwood sites.

To complicate life further, Germany is a relatively small country and depends heavily on international trade to support a highly specialized national economy. The domestic market is therefore open to wood and wood products from the Scandinavian countries, the Soviet bloc, and Canada. The German foresters find themselves in the uncomfortable position of being price-takers in a market where supply is not determined by the production costs of growing timber in Germany.

The only solutions to the market problem appear to be to change the forest yield and to reduce production costs. German forests have been managed at an intensity we have never seen in the United States. It is not uncommon for a forest of 15 to 20 thousand acres to be managed by a university-trained forester assisted by four or five graduates of one of the two-year forestry schools. With such a staff, very detailed silvicultural management can be planned and supervised. There is some problem in convincing the older foresters to change to new practices and to accept new ideas. But basically they are well equipped for the problems of converting their forests to more economic types if it were not for the cost involved. The small "Forstamts" are just not economic-sized management units under today's conditions. So efforts are being made to consolidate them into larger units and to reduce the overhead costs. As may be expected, the personnel and administrative problems of such a reorganization are severe.

The third and critical problem is the severe shortage of labor in West Germany. There are already several million "guest workers" from Italy, Spain, Yugoslavia, and other countries. Forestry has been severely hit -- wages have been raised but it is still hard to find enough workers. Many forestry jobs are now done by older women and it is obvious that younger women will not go into this kind of work when other opportunities exist. Mechanization is being pushed hard in all aspects of forestry. This is another pressure for consolidating management units since the present units are too small to fully use or pay for the large harvesting and road maintenance machines needed to replace men. It is clear that silvicultural practices will also have to change from the traditional labour-intensive methods. With some species, it has been common to plant from 20 to 40 thousand seedlings per acre and then to apply cleanings and pre-commercial thinnings at very short intervals. Now that there is no market for brushwood and labor is scarce and expensive, such a methodology is economically prohibitive. Already spruce and fir are being planted at spacings as wide as six feet and a real revolution in silvicultural practices seems inevitable.

Forestry in Germany is still much more traditional and formal than in the United States but everywhere one receives impressions that change is taking place. The German foresters have enjoyed a status in their country never attained by American foresters. It is going to be interesting and instructive to see how they deal with the problems of forest use in a highly industrialized and affluent society that we are also facing here.

---



## International visits

WCFET. Prof. Osara attended the World Consultation on Forestry Education and Training, held in Stockholm 28.9-7.10. Since his return he has acquired a complete set of the draft proceedings. This is not to be taken lightly - they weigh several kilos!

Oslo and Vollebekk. Michael Jones was in Norway during the last two weeks of October. While there, he visited the Norwegian College of Agriculture at Vollebekk and the Department of Geography at Oslo University.

Iowa State University. On 4th November, Bruce Senti and Douglas Kuehn, forestry students from Iowa State University (Ames, Iowa), visited the Department. They had spent the summer and early autumn working for Enso-Gutzeit (Finland's largest forestry enterprise) in eastern Finland and were visiting Helsinki for a few days before returning home.

Nordic co-operation. The recent trip made to Stockholm and Oslo by Prof. Heikinheimo and Jan Heino was extremely successful in establishing contacts and exchanging ideas. It is hoped that the interest aroused by the trip will result in a definite co-operative project in forest recreation. Jan Heino comments on the trip as follows:

From 3rd to 9th October, Prof. Heikinheimo and I had the opportunity of spending a week in Sweden and Norway. The purpose of the trip was to collect information on the relationships between forestry and outdoor recreation, and to try to initiate a joint project concerning conflicts between these two forms of land use.

In spite of the short time, our hosts in Stockholm and Oslo managed to take us on excursions to nearby forests for on-the-spot illustrations of conflicts between different land uses and of the possibilities for co-ordination, that is "multiple use". Besides information from the recreation areas, we also received much printed material, particularly new and very useful bibliographies. However, the discussions with nature-conservation, outdoor-recreation and forestry people were the most fruitful.

The present relationships between outdoor recreation and forestry seem to be pretty much alike in Norway, Sweden and Finland. The current nature-conservation debate, which at times has been irrelevant and exaggerated, has now begun to be concerned with social nature conservation. Conflicts between forestry and outdoor recreation have arisen in the three countries and the following forestry practices have been singled out as being very ill-suited to recreation areas: soil scarification, clear-cutting large areas, using chemical pesticides, digging drainage ditches, planting abandoned arable land, building heavy forest roads, and replacing broad-leaved trees with coniferous ones. Depending on how intensive the recreational use is, management of forest areas by means of these wood-producing activities should be avoided and methods which do not cause conflicts should be given priority. In this connection, the compensation question is very complicated.

In the vicinity of population centres, the recreational uses of forests should often be considered to be the dominant forms of land use, since certain forestry practices may make the forest area unfit for walking, berry-picking, studying nature and so forth. The city-owned forests near Oslo, Stockholm and Helsinki are good examples of how heavily frequent areas can be managed - multiple-use principles are applied according to the needs of every separate ecosystem. In particular, the management

of the Oslo forests for outdoor recreation struck us during a tour through Osломarka. Interest in all kinds of outdoor-recreation and nature-conservation problems is very pronounced in Norway, Sweden and Finland. Accordingly, the possibilities of starting a co-operative project on outdoor recreation related to forestry with forest researchers in these three countries (and hopefully Denmark also) seem to be good. The institutes and agencies which during our trip were most helpful to us but which would not directly participate in such a project could be consulted concerning special questions. In that way, contacts between different agencies would be promoted and all parties could get the information being produced.

Prof. Heikinheimo and I would like to warmly thank our personal and institutional hosts in Stockholm and Oslo for making our visit so useful and enjoyable.

---

### Personnel changes

At the end of October, Erkki Raittila finished his work for Terho Huttunen. It is reported that he has gone back to studying forestry.

Leif Niemi has tidied up the odds and ends he was working on. He left the Department on 1st November to begin working for Prof. Gustaf Sirén in the Department of Silviculture at the University of Helsinki.

Simo Penttilä joined the Department on 1st November. He comes to us from the Department of Silviculture at the University of Helsinki. He will be continuing the work on nursery economics that was begun by Pentti Kuokkanen.

On 3rd November, Pirjo Saramäki left the Department to join her husband at the Pyhäkoski Experiment Station in Muhos. She had completed the basic work for her laudatur paper, which deals with the reasons for changes in the consumption of fuelwood on farms and in buildings.

Juhani Hongisto will be taking Erkki Raittila's place as Terho's assistant from the middle of November. He is a forestry student at Helsinki University and is studying forest policy, marketing and business economics.

---

### Personal information

(Supplement to Folia Forestalia 87)

Nissilä, Olli Viljo Iivari  
b. 27.1.1950

Degrees: Ekon. 1971

Positions held:

1971 f. Forest Research Institute. Assistant researcher.

Languages: Finnish, English, Swedish

Projects: Assisting Matti Palo in his studies of recycling paper, organizational rationalization of state-owned forest industry, and optimization of roundwood harvesting using network analysis (project 3.06).

Penttilä, Simo Veli  
 b. 30.10.1945  
 Family: 1970 m. Marja Aalto

Degrees: MH 1970

Positions held:

1970-71 University of Helsinki. Assistant.  
 1971 f. Forest Research Institute. Researcher.

Present academic studies: systems, business accounting and business mathematics at the Helsinki School of Economics.

Languages: Finnish, English, Swedish.

Projects: Beginning work on project no. 3.10, "the costs of forest planting in 1971." The study will investigate the costs of planting Scotch pine and Norway spruce in Finland in 1971. Information is to be requested by letter. Costs will be divided between three categories: costs of seedlings, planting costs and costs of site preparation. It is important that these costs be determined as they form the basis for decisions by the forestry authorities on the charges to be levied for ensuring the regeneration of cut-over areas.

Ollikainen, Tatu Pekka  
 b. 2.8.1947  
 Family: 1971 m. Siiri Järvillehto

Degrees: MH 1970

Positions held:

1971 f. Forest Research Institute. Assistant researcher.

Present academic studies: MMK in forest products marketing.

Languages: Finnish, Swedish, German, English, Russian.

Projects: Working on a survey of the capital-equipment costs of the Finnish forest products industry. The initiative for this comes from the Forest Economics Research Institute of the Canadian Forestry Service, where a study of the "effects of capital-equipment costs on the competitive position of the forest products industry in Canada and abroad" is being undertaken. Initially the study will be confined to an international price comparison. A possible second phase is a more detailed inquiry into the effects of price differentials on productivity rates in the forest products industry.

Tikkanen, Ilpo Uolevi  
 b. 24.9.1949

Positions held:

1969-1970 Forest Research Institute. Research assistant.  
 1971 f. Forest Research Institute. Assistant researcher.

Present academic studies: MH and MMK in national economics of forestry.

Languages: Finnish, Swedish, German, English

Projects: Writing a laudatur paper about the promotion of private forestry among farmers and non-farmers. This forms a sub-section of Arne Reunala's study concerning the structural changes in forest ownership (project no. 2.13).

### Meetings

The conference on forestry manpower questions which was held in Tyrvnt on 12th October was attended by Aarne Reunala, Hannu Vehvilinen and Markku Aho, in addition to Prof. Heikinheimo, who read a paper.

Marja Harmanen, the researchers and the assistant researchers were the Department's representatives at the Institute's "Internal information days" on 2nd and 3rd November. Not all of them were able to be away from their research for two full days - they came and went at various times.

---

### Television

Finnish forest workers will be the subject of a television programme scheduled for 24th November. The programme attempts to describe the life of forest workers from their point of view. It makes use of the information Aarne Reunala and Matti Heikinheimo collected in their study of the standard of living of forest workers. Pekka Patosaari, a forestry student at Helsinki University, is the producer and Aarne is a member of the planning group.

---

### Parliament

In the beginning of October each of the 200 members of the Finnish parliament received a copy of Hannu Vehvilinen's publication, "Power-saw costs of forest workers in 1969-1970" (Folia Forestalia, 106). This was in connection with the debate about the taxation of forest workers in 1972. In his study, Hannu found that forest workers spend 20% of their annual gross earnings on the capital and running costs of their power saws. At present, forest workers are allowed tax deductions of 30-40% of their gross income. However, their social benefits (pension and sick leave) are calculated from their taxable income. This has created additional hardships for a group which already suffers under difficult working conditions. There is now a movement among professional forest workers to have the law changed.

---

### Regional planning

The Department recently received a mimeographed publication "Tampereen seutukaava-alueen metstlouden tyvoiman ennuste. (Forestry labour-force forecast for the Tampere regional-planning area)." The work was done in January 1970 by Jan Heino; the Department had been requested by Tampereen Seutukaavaliitto (Tampere Regional Planning Association) to make the study. It was published (with an obscure credit to Jan and the Department) in 1971 by Tampereen Seutukaavaliitto as number B 18 of the stenciled series "Pirkanmaan Seutukaavoitus."

---

### English test

The 1971 edition of the English test for the Department occurred as planned on October 15th. Thirteen people took part and no one succumbed to the strain. In fact, there were no complaints at all from the participants. Everyone felt that the test was difficult, but good. Below are this year's results. Perhaps next year everyone in the Department will try testing their knowledge of English.

Markku Aho	A-	Lorenzo Runeberg	A-
Marja Harmanen	B	Sampsa Sivonen	C+
Lasse Heikinheimo	A-	Brita Sjöstrand	B
Jan Heino	A-	Maija-Liisa Soveri	A-
Seija Malinen	C	Ilpo Tikkanen	C+
Leif Niemi	C+	Hannu Vehviläinen	C
Tatu Ollikainen	B+		

---

### Departmental news

Spanish is Maija-Liisa Soveri's latest undertaking. Once a week she has a conversation lesson with a young man from Ecuador.

Bestseller. Much to his surprise, Lorenzo Runeberg has discovered that his publication on plastics in the forest industry is in great demand. It is sold out at the State Printing Centre - now you must get your copy from the Institute, free of charge.

---

### Working Saturdays and other thoughts

All Saints' Day this year was on 6th November. This is a Saturday holiday, which means that we don't have to suffer the nuisance of a working Saturday to make up for a holiday in the middle of the week. Instead, we had to suffer the nuisance of having to do all our weekend shopping on Friday (a full working-day).

Finnish Independence Day on 6th December is a Monday this year, so we'll have to work on Saturday 11th instead, an ideal arrangement for avoiding Christmas shopping.

The trade unions are proposing that the Church holidays of Epiphany, Whit Monday and Ascension Day be moved to the nearest Saturday to avoid the upheaval of a mid-week holiday followed by a working Saturday. One might have expected the unions to be campaigning for both the mid-week holiday and the Saturday to be free days, but the struggle for higher wages does not leave time for such thoughts. A holiday on Saturday, which for most people is already a holiday, is not entirely the contradiction it seems. It means in effect that we have two Sundays in a row; shop-keepers get a double holiday and priests must work two days in succession.

It is all very confusing, and soon nobody will be sure which working-days are holidays and which holidays working-days. We would like to make a suggestion. Why not transfer all mid-week holidays to a Sunday? Then even the shops would not have the inconvenience of having to close on a Saturday.